

Supreme Court, U. S.  
FILED

FEB 19 1976

SHIRLEY BODAK, JR., CLERK

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

No. **75-1189**

---

CAPTAIN LEWIS T. MOORE,

*Petitioner,*

—v.—

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,  
Secretary of Defense, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

---

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

---

---

MELVIN L. WULF  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Foundation  
22 East 40th Street  
New York, New York 10016

WILLIAM F. REYNARD  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Foundation of Colorado  
719 University Building  
Denver, Colorado 80202

*Attorneys for Petitioner*

ROBERT TABOR BOOMS  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Foundation of Colorado  
719 University Building  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
*Of Counsel*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Citations to Opinions Below . . .	2
Jurisdiction. . . . .	2
Questions Presented . . . . .	2
Statutory Provisions Involved . .	3
Statement of the Case . . . . .	3
Reasons for Granting the Writ . .	7
Conclusion. . . . .	11

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

Bell v. Hood, 327 U.S. 678 (1946)	7, 8, 9
Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388. . . .	3, 7, 9
Carlson v. Schlesinger, 511 F. 2d 1327 (D.C. Cir. 1975). . . . .	8
Murray v. Vaughn, 300 F. Supp. 688 (D.R.I. 1969). . . . .	10
Parker v. Levy, 417 U.S. 733 (1974)	8

Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232 (1974) . . . . .	9
St. Paul Mercury Co. v. Red Cab Co., 303 U.S. 283 (1938) . . . .	10
 <u>Other Authorities</u>	
Emerson, Humber & Dorsen, Political and Civil Rights in the United States (Fourth Edition) pp. 1315-1316 . . . . .	9

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

October Term, 1975

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

CAPTAIN LEWIS T. MOORE,

Petitioner,

v.

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,  
Secretary of Defense, et al.,

Respondents.

---

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

Petitioner, Captain Lewis T. Moore,  
prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to  
review the judgment of the United States  
Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit,  
entered on November 21, 1975. The Court  
of Appeals affirmed the judgment of the  
United States District Court for the

District of Colorado entered on October 29, 1974, dismissing the case for lack of jurisdiction.

#### CITATIONS TO OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals, which is unreported, is set out in the Appendix, infra, p. 1a. The opinion of the District Court, which is unreported, is set out in the Appendix, infra, p. 9a.

#### JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

#### QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Where a verified complaint alleges that a military person's tour of duty as an instructor at the Air Force Academy was improperly terminated and a punitive transfer to other duty imposed, all as a result of the writing of letters to Congress critical of practices at the Academy, was it proper to dismiss the complaint for lack of jurisdiction, on the following grounds:

1. That "only when military actions are so restrictive of a soldier's fundamental rights as to deny them altogether and thus constitute an abuse of the broad

discretion granted to military officers in their command, will the Court be said to have jurisdiction to review the merits of such a dispute?"

2. That the requisite jurisdictional amount under 28 U.S.C. §1331 was absent, even though petitioner had not been afforded an opportunity to prove the amount in controversy requirement?

3. That the complaint did not state a cause of action under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388?

#### STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

10 U.S.C. §1034:

"Communicating with a member of Congress. No person may restrict any member of an armed force in communicating with a member of Congress, unless the communication is unlawful or violates a regulation necessary to the security of the United States."

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE 1/

Petitioner is a graduate of the Air

---

1/ The Statement of the case is taken



Force Academy and a regular commissioned officer in the United States Air Force. In 1970 he was assigned to a four-year tour, through June of 1974, to the faculty of the United States Air Force Academy as an instructor. During the first three years of his teaching he received a consistently high rating as "outstanding." On February 20, 1973, petitioner wrote various members of Congress about Academy policies and practices concerning faculty tenure, the honor system, handling of cadet morale and drug problems, the high cadet attrition rate, and problems of internal and external credibility.

As a result of these letters, investigations of the Academy were launched almost immediately by the General Accounting Office and the high command of the Air Force. On March 13, 1973, Moore was assured by the head of his department that there would be no retaliation. Nevertheless, as a result of the letters and within a few days after the Accounting Office investigation was started, his four-year tour of teaching was curtailed and, while teaching a class, he was given a notice of termination on March 23, 1973. The complaint alleges that his removal from the classroom was in retaliation for having written the letters, a device to

---

from petitioners' complaint whose allegations are taken as true on a motion to dismiss.

restrict his right to communicate with members of Congress, and intended to force his resignation. Petitioner claimed that the basis for his removal stated in the letter of termination--"inability to instill career-service motivation in cadets"--was totally spurious and that the respondents Academy staff members, motivated by a desire to stop him from communicating with members of Congress and to interfere with his rights of free speech and association, conspired to intimidate petitioner and thus prevent him from continuing to hold his office as an instructor at the Air Force Academy.

He alleged also that in furtherance of this pattern of intimidation and conspiracy, the respondents knowingly and in conference with each other engaged in a pattern of retaliatory and intimidating conduct toward the petitioner, including an invitation to him to resign; an order to see the staff psychiatrist; restriction from any contact with cadets; subjection to a series of orders severely limiting his freedom of movement and activity and his right to attend classes at Denver University; and further orders to move out of his faculty office and to remove his personal books and effects.

On May 10, 1973, Moore initiated a complaint under Article 138, Uniform Code of Military Justice, complaining of all of the foregoing violations of his rights. The request for redress was denied the following month. Petitioner was assigned

temporarily to Ent Air Force Base, Colorado, on May 2, 1973 as a weather officer. On June 27, 1973, petitioner was notified in writing that he was due for permanent reassignment during the month of July 1973. On July 3, 1973, petitioner filed this action seeking to restrain his permanent transfer, to secure reinstatement to the Air Force Academy faculty, and for money damages. The application to restrain the transfer was denied.

Discovery was thereafter undertaken. Respondents filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on May 31, 1974. The case was subsequently transferred to Honorable Richard P. Matsch, who treated the motion for summary judgment as a motion to dismiss (App., infra, p. 12a) and entered an Order of Dismissal on October 29, 1974 for lack of jurisdiction. Petitioner appealed.

While appeal was pending, petitioner received an overseas assignment. On May 15, 1975, petitioner voluntarily submitted his resignation from all appointments in the Air Force to be effective September 1, 1975, and separation orders were issued on that day. The Court of Appeals heard oral argument on the day after petitioner's resignation became effective. The Circuit Court affirmed the Order of Dismissal of the trial Court on November 21, 1975.

The Court of Appeals, affirmed on the following grounds (even though there was

no evidentiary record in the case) (App., infra, pp. 6a-8a):

1. "Only when military actions are so restrictive of a soldier's fundamental rights as to deny them altogether and thus constitute an abuse of the broad discretion granted to military officers in their command will the court be said to have jurisdiction to review the merits of such a dispute."

2. That the amount in controversy requirement of 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1331, though alleged, was not satisfied.

3. That Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S. 388, "has been narrowly read and itself recognizes the immunity of officials who are performing discretionary acts. . ."

#### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. In declining to exercise jurisdiction in this case, the Tenth Circuit ignored the fundamental doctrine which has been enunciated by this Court at least since Bell v. Hood, 327 U.S. 678 (1946), that "the court must assume jurisdiction to decide whether the allegations state a cause of action on which the court can grant relief as well as to determine issues of fact arising in the controversy." Id. at 682. In deciding the case the way it did, the Tenth Circuit simply ignored the equally elementary doctrine of Bell v. Hood that "whether the complaint



states a cause of action on which relief could be granted is a question of law and just as issues of fact it must be decided after and not before the court has assumed jurisdiction over the controversy." Ibid.

It is clear from the opinion of the Court of Appeals that in dismissing the complaint for lack of jurisdiction, it was simply pre-judging the merits, as a matter of both law and fact.

Even in its own terms, the Tenth Circuit's opinion is fatally wrong, for it is not the rule that "only when military actions are so restrictive of a soldier's fundamental rights as to deny them altogether . . . will the court be said to have jurisdiction to review the merits of such a dispute" (App., infra, p. 6a ). Cf. Parker v. Levy, 417 U.S. 733 (1974); Carlson v. Schlesinger, 511 F. 2d 1327 (D.C. Cir. 1975). For whether rights are denied "altogether" requires a factual determination on the merits, if only based on the allegations of the complaint. But by declining to exercise jurisdiction, the Tenth Circuit clearly has ignored the merits.

The disposition of the case by the Tenth Circuit demonstrates such an elementary misunderstanding of the difference between the exercise of jurisdiction and review on the merits, that the decision below should be summarily reversed with a per

curiam opinion directing the Court of Appeals' attention to Bell v. Hood, supra.

2. The Tenth Circuit supported dismissal of petitioner's complaint on the further ground that, with respect to the money damage claims against the individual defendants, Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) "has been narrowly read and itself recognizes the immunity of officials who are performing discretionary acts exercising discretionary authority." App., infra, p. 7a-8a. <sup>2/</sup> This holding is so clearly erroneous, it alone supports summary reversal on this petition. First, Bivens has not been "narrowly read." See cases collected in Emerson, Humber & Dorsen's Political and Civil Rights in the United States (Fourth Edition), pp. 1315-1316. Second, the question of immunity must follow not precede trial. Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232 (1974).

The fact that 10 U.S.C. §1034 provides no specific sanctions, either civil or criminal, does not foreclose the availability of a remedy, for as Mr. Justice Brennan points out in Bivens, (403 U.S. at 396):

Of course, the Fourth Amendment does not in so many words

---

<sup>2/</sup> The district court held explicitly that Bivens was "limited to Fourth Amendment rights." App., infra, p.

provide for its enforcement by an award of money damages for the consequences of its violation. But "It is . . . well settled that where rights have been invaded, and a federal statute provides for a general right to sue for such invasion, federal courts may use any available remedy to make good the wrong done." Bell v. Hood, 327 U.S. at 684.

3. The third fundamental error committed below was to decline to exercise jurisdiction on the ground that petitioner failed to meet the jurisdictional amount requirement of 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1331. It is basic doctrine that it must appear to a legal certainty that a claim is worth less than \$10,000 before a court may dismiss on that ground. St. Paul Mercury Co. v. Red Cab Company, 303 U.S. 283 (1938). There was no such certainty here, for petitioner had alleged his unlawful removal from his faculty post, removal from his family, interruption of his work toward an advanced degree and damage to his professional reputation. Surely, in the face of those claims, no court could reasonably hold prior to trial that petitioners' damages could, to a legal certainty, be said to fall short of \$10,000. Cf. Murray v. Vaughn, 300 F. Supp. 688 (D.R.I. 1969).

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

MELVIN L. WOLF  
American Civil Liberties  
Union Foundation  
22 East 40th Street  
New York, New York 10016

WILLIAM F. REYNARD  
American Civil Liberties  
Union Foundation of  
Colorado  
719 University Building  
Denver, Colorado 80202

Attorneys for Petitioner

ROBERT TABOR BOOMS  
American Civil Liberties  
Union Foundation of  
Colorado  
719 University Building  
Denver, Colorado 80202

Of Counsel

February, 1976



# **APPENDICES**

1a.

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

FILED

Nov 21 1975

Howard K. Phillips  
Clerk, United States  
Court of Appeals  
Tenth Circuit

NOT FOR ROUTINE PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
TENTH CIRCUIT  
-----

No. 74-1882  
-----

CAPTAIN LEWIS T. MOORE,	)	
	)	Appeal From The
Appellant,	)	United States
	)	District Court
v.	)	For The District
	)	of Colorado
JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,	)	
Secretary of Defense;	)	(D.C. #Civ.5152)
DR. JOHN L. McLUCAS,	)	
Acting Secretary of the	)	
Air Force, GENERAL JOHN	)	
D. RYAN, Air Force Chief	)	
of Staff; LT. GENERAL A.	)	
P. CLARK, Superintendent	)	
of the Air Force Adademy;	)	

2a.

BRIG. GENERAL WILLIAM T. WOODYARD, )  
Dean of Faculty, U.S.A.F. Academy; )  
COL. ROBERT G. TAYLOR, Professor )  
and Head of Department of Geography, )  
U.S.A.F. Academy; LT. COL. HARRY W. )  
EMRICK, Associate Professor of )  
Geography, U.S.A.F. Academy, )  
Appellees. )

-----  
William F. Reynard, American Civil Liberties  
Union Foundation of Colorado, Inc., Denver,  
Colorado (Robert Tabor Booms, Denver, Colorado,  
with him on the Brief), for Appellant.

Captain Bruce Clark, U.S.A.F., Litigation  
Division, Office of the Judge Advocate General,  
Washington, D.C. (James L. Treece, United  
States Attorney, and Gary M. Jackson, Assistant  
United States Attorney, with him on the Brief),  
for Appellees.

-----  
Before LEWIS, Chief Judge, SETH and McWILLIAMS,  
Circuit Judges.

-----  
PER CURIAM.  
-----

At the time this litigation was initiated,  
appellant was a Captain in the United States

3a.

Air Force. He had been a commissioned officer  
in the regular Air Force since 1966, when he  
was graduated from the Air Force Academy. In  
1970, he was assigned for a four-year tour of  
duty to the faculty of the Academy in the  
Department of Geography. Of the ten Officer  
Effectiveness Reports accomplished on appellant  
since his initial duty assignment in 1966, five  
had rated him as "exceptionally fine" and fine  
as "outstanding." In February 1973, appellant  
wrote various members of Congress expressing  
his views on policies at the Academy. On  
March 13, 1973, appellant was advised by his  
supervising officer appellee, Colonel Robert  
G. Taylor, that the Academy administration was  
aware of those letters but that no adverse  
action would be taken as a result of them.

On March 23, 1973, more than a year prior  
to the expiration of his tour to the faculty,  
appellant was called out of his classroom and  
was relieved of duty as an instructor by appel-  
lees Taylor and Lieutenant Colonel Harry W.  
Emrick. The reason given later was lack of  
motivation to pursue an Air Force wide career,  
which lack led to an inability to motivate the  
cadets in his classes. Appellee Taylor ordered  
appellant to see the Staff Psychiatrist at the  
Academy, and ordered appellant to have no fur-  
ther contact with the cadet wing. In April,  
1973, appellant was temporarily detailed to Ent  
Air Force Base, and in June he was permanently  
reassigned to Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska.  
Some time earlier, appellant had initiated a  
complaint under Article 138 of the Uniform Code



4a.

of Military Justice, requesting redress of grievances relating to matters here in controversy. The request was denied by appellant's commanding officer, appellee Taylor, and later by the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over Taylor, appellee Clark. The action was subsequently reviewed and approved by the authorized designee of the Secretary of the Air Force.

At about that same time, appellant filed this action seeking a declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, relief in the form of mandamus, and a writ of habeas corpus to reverse his reassignment to Offutt and order his reinstatement as an instructor at the Academy. He further sought damages for violation of his constitutional right to freedom of expression. The United States District Court for the District of Colorado denied appellant's motion for preliminary injunctive relief and later ordered the case dismissed for lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter. Thereafter, and while this appeal was pending, appellant received an overseas assignment. On May 15, 1975, appellant voluntarily submitted his resignation from all appointments in the Air Force to be effective September 1, 1975. This resignation was submitted the last day of an extension granted appellant by the Air Force to decide whether he wished to accept that overseas assignment. The office of the Secretary of the Air Force accepted appellant's resignation, and he was ordered discharged. Separation orders were issued effective September 1, 1975.

5a.

Oral argument in this case was heard by this court on the day after appellant's resignation became effective. The resignation by appellant is such a change of status as to significantly alter the remedies available to him and these proceedings. Since appellant is no longer a member of the Air Force, the courts cannot grant him the interservice remedies he requested in his complaint. Appellant cannot be reassigned to the Academy as an instructor, no mandamus or habeas corpus relief is appropriate, and a declaratory judgment would no longer affect the rights of the litigants. The situation is not capable of repetition, nor is it evading review by its nature. Instead appellant by his own action caused the issue here to become moot. The First Amendment challenge to the military's power to reassign raised by appellant in this action is no longer a controversy capable of resolution by this court in the form of interservice remedies, and as to these remedies the case is rendered moot. See DeFunis v. Odegaard, 416 U.S. 312.

The only remedy that could survive appellant's resignation is his damage claim for violation of his constitutional right. Appellant alleges his termination as an instructor and subsequent transfer from the Academy were punitive, retaliatory measures taken in response to his exercise of his First Amendment privilege in writing to Congress. It has been recognized that "... citizens in uniform may not be stripped of basic rights simply because

6a.

they have doffed their civilian clothes," as stated by former Chief Justice Earl Warren and quoted by this court in *Kennedy v. Commandant, U.S. Disciplinary Barracks*, 377 F.2d 339 (10th Cir.). Another court has held that persons do not lose their First Amendment rights by joining the armed forces. *Cortright v. Resor*, 447 F.2d 245 (2d Cir.). Rather, that court asserted that "... right ... should be preserved to the maximum extent possible, consistent with good order and discipline and national security ... [and] the effectiveness of the unit." When a soldier's fundamental rights are involved, the test becomes one of balancing military demands against individual freedoms. *Carlson v. Schlesinger*, 364 F.Supp. 626 (D.C.). Only when military actions are so restrictive of a soldier's fundamental rights as to deny them altogether and thus constitute an abuse of the broad discretion granted to military officers in their command will the court be said to have jurisdiction to review the merits of such a dispute.

In this case, the recognition of appellant's constitutional right must be weighed against the traditional policy of judicial noninterference in military duty assignments. *Oroloff v. Willoughby*, 345 U.S. 83; *Noyd v. McNamara*, 378 F.2d 538 (10th Cir.). The record indicates the allegations are not sufficient to allow this court to interfere with the authorized exercise of discretion by Air Force officials and entertain jurisdiction over the dispute. The lower court in its dismissal order states that "... assuming the truth of all

7a.

the factual allegations made by Captain Moore, there is no adequate showing of such an abuse of discretion as to warrant interference by a civilian court." This demonstrates the analysis made by the trial court was correct under the authorities. It shows that no abuse of discretion is asserted in the facts alleged, sufficient to establish jurisdiction. The threat to First Amendment freedom, as appellant presents it here, does not justify judicial interference in a matter involving military discretion.

Even if the court had found sufficient grounds to justify intervention, there are other defects in the jurisdiction asserted by appellant. Jurisdiction is not established under section 1985 of the Civil Rights Act, as that section is inapplicable by its own terms. Nor can appellant establish jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, the general federal question category. To maintain his action under this section, appellant must satisfy the amount in controversy requirement. *Lynch v. Household Finance Corp.*, 405 U.S. 538. His transfer from duty at the Academy did not affect his rank or salary. Further, there is a general prohibition against suing federal officers who are acting within the scope of their authority. *Bethea v. Reid*, 445 F.2d 1163 (3d Cir.). Although in *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388, the United States Supreme Court allowed Bivens' claims against federal agents for violation of his Fourth Amendment rights, that case has been narrowly read and itself recognizes the immunity



8a.

of officials who are performing discretionary acts exercising discretionary authority. Appellant has failed to establish jurisdiction of his claim.

It is unclear just what jurisdictional basis appellant claims in asking for judicial review of the Article 138 proceeding conducted in his behalf. The court has no power to review administrative rulings by courts-martial and military commissions as is clear from the section 701(b)(1)(F) exemption to the Administrative Procedures Act. *Cortright v. Resor*, 447 F.2d 245 (2d Cir.). The trial court correctly treated the motion of appellees for summary judgment as one to dismiss. *Thompson v. United States*, 291 F.2d 67 (10th Cir.).

Mootness as to certain requested measures of relief, a long-standing policy of judicial noninterference in military matters requiring discretion, and otherwise defective jurisdictional allegations all require the court to hold that no cause of action is alleged, and no adequate allegations of jurisdiction has been made.

AFFIRMED.

9a.

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT

FILED  
United States District Court  
Denver, Colorado

OCT 29 1974

JAMES R. MANSPEAKER  
By \_\_\_\_\_ Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. C-5152

CAPTAIN LEWIS T. MOORE,  
510-46-9657FR

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, Secretary  
of Defense; DR. JOHN L. McLUCAS,  
Acting Secretary of the Air  
Force; GENERAL JOHN D. RYAN, Air  
Force Chief of Staff; LT. GENERAL  
A. P. CLARK, Superintendent of  
the Air Force Academy; BRIG.  
GENERAL WILLIAM T. WOODYARD, Dean  
of Faculty, U.S.A.F. Academy; COL.



10a.

ROBERT G. TAYLOR, Professor and  
Head of Department of Geography,  
U.S.A.F. Academy; LT. COL. HARRY  
W. EMRICK, Associate Professor  
of Geography, U.S.A.F. Academy,

Defendants.

---

William F. Reynard of Reynard, Dorward  
& Booms, P.C., 719 University Building,  
Denver, Colorado, 80202, for plaintiffs;  
James L. Treece, United States Attorney,  
323 United States Courthouse, Denver, Colorado  
80202 and Bruce E. Clark, Captain, USAF,  
Office of The Judge Advocate General, Washing-  
ton, D.C. 20314, for defendants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

MATSCH, Judge

The following is a statement of uncon-  
troverted facts from a pre-trial order entered  
herein on March 15, 1974:

"The Plaintiff is a Captain in the  
United States Air Force and is presently  
assigned at Offutt Air Force Base,  
Nebraska. Plaintiff has been a commis-  
sioned officer in the regular Air Force  
since 1966. In 1970 he was assigned for  
a tour to the faculty of the Air Force

11a.

Academy in the Department of Geography.  
Of the ten Officer Effectiveness  
Reports accomplished on plaintiff  
since his initial duty assignment in  
1966, five have rated him as "excep-  
tionally fine" and five as "outstanding."  
In February 1973, Plaintiff wrote var-  
ious members of Congress. On March 13,  
1973, Plaintiff was advised by the  
defendant Taylor that the administration  
of the Academy was aware of the letters  
to Congress but that no adverse action  
would be taken as a result of them. The  
Plaintiff was removed from his position  
as an instructor on 23 March 1973 by  
Colonel Robert G. Taylor and Lt. Colonel  
Harry W. Emrick. On 27 March 1973 de-  
fendant Taylor ordered Plaintiff to see  
the Staff Psychiatrist at the Air Force  
Academy. On 29 March 1973, defendant  
Taylor ordered the Plaintiff not to have  
contact with the cadets. On 10 April  
1973 the plaintiff was ordered by the  
defendant Emrick not to perform duties  
as a timer in Academy track meets. The  
Plaintiff initiated a complaint under  
Article 138, Uniform Code of Military  
Justice, requesting redress of griev-  
ances relating to matters here in con-  
troversy. In June, 1973, the request  
for redress was denied by the Plaintiff's  
commander, the defendant Taylor, and  
later by the officer exercising general  
court-martial jurisdiction over Taylor,  
the defendant Lt. General A. P. Clark,

12a.

The action was subsequently reviewed and approved by the authorized designee of the Secretary of the Air Force."

The judge presiding at that pre-trial conference granted the defendants an opportunity to file a motion for a summary judgment "directed to the jurisdictional aspects of the case" and within the time set by that order the defendants did file such a motion seeking a summary judgment for defendants for a lack of jurisdiction. That motion is now before the Court and it is to be considered as a motion to dismiss for a lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter of the plaintiff's claims for relief.

By this complaint, the plaintiff requests relief by way of a declaratory judgment that his removal from a teaching assignment at the Offutt Air Force Base were wrongful and were violative of his constitutional rights; that he is entitled to money damages; that he is entitled to injunctive relief by mandamus and he has petitioned for a writ of habeas corpus. Additionally he seeks judicial review of the denial of relief on his complaint under Article 138, Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The essential allegations that the administrative actions taken by the defendants, who are or were officers superior to the plaintiff in the chain of command, were in retaliation for the plaintiff's exercise of First Amendment rights and constituted an intimidation and a conspiracy to restrict and limit those rights.

13a.

The plaintiff urges jurisdiction of his claim for damages in 28 U.S.C. 1331. While defendants contend that there can be no showing of damages exceeding \$10,000.00, it is assumed that the jurisdictional amount is present in this case. The theory of damage liability is not a general tort theory but an alleged violation of 42 U.S.C. 1985(1), which provides, in pertinent part:

"(1) If two or more persons in any state or territory conspire to prevent, by force, intimidation, or threat, any person from accepting or holding any office, trust, or place of confidence under the United States, or from discharging any duties thereof. . ."

the party injured or aggrieved may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned thereby. The statute does not appear applicable by its own terms. Moreover, it has regularly been held that federal officers acting under color of federal law are immune from suit under this statute. Bethea v. Reid, 445 F.2d/ 1163 (3rd Cir. 1971), Williams v. Halperin, 360 F.Supp. 554 (S.D. N.Y. 1973).

It is argued, though, that there is a right to recover damages directly under the Constitution as recognized in Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). In that case the Supreme Court majority did find a cause of action for damages caused by an un-

14a.

reasonable search and seizure. The interpretation of that opinion made by the Court of Appeals, Second Circuit in Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents, 456 F. 2d 1339 (1972) is informative here. Against the historical background and within the context of the other cases on immunity and discretion of federal officers discussed at length in that opinion, it must be concluded that the Bivens doctrine should be limited to Fourth Amendment rights and it is not applicable here.

In my view, there is no jurisdiction in this Court to grant relief in damages for the acts alleged in the plaintiff's complaint.

The remainder of the relief requested is to request interdiction of the military orders and cause a reassignment of the plaintiff to his former duty station. There is no jurisdiction to do so. This is not a proper petition for habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. 2241 because the plaintiff does not seek release from the military service and it has been held that the writ is not appropriate for review of military duty assignments. Orloff v. Willoughby, 345 U.S. 83 (1953).

The plaintiff contends for mandamus, 28 U.S.C. 1361, to compel performance of a duty owed to him under the First Amendment and under 10 U.S.C. 1034 which provides as follows:

"No person may restrict any member of an armed force in communicating with a

15a.

member of Congress, unless the communication is unlawful or violates a regulation necessary to the security of the United States."

In Cortright v. Resor, 447 F.2d 245 (2nd Cir. 1971), the court assumed jurisdiction under § 1361 to rescind a military transfer alleged to have been made in retaliation for the exercise of First Amendment rights; but the district court's order was reversed because the facts failed to show an abuse of the broad discretion granted to military officers in their commands. Assuming the truth of all of the factual allegations made by Captain Moore, there is no adequate showing of such an abuse of discretion as to warrant interference by a civilian court.

There is finally the question of a judicial review of the denial of relief in the Article 138 proceedings. It is urged that the procedure followed was inadequate and procedurally invalid. There is no statutory authority for a civilian court review of these administrative proceedings and they are expressly excluded from the Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. 701(b)(F). To characterize the question as judicial review is to add nothing to the jurisdictional questions already discussed.

The plaintiff's request for convening a three-judge court under 28 U.S.C. 2282 was denied previously because nothing in the



16a.

complaint seeks to enjoin the operation on execution of any statute as unconstitutional.

Upon the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the complaint and this cause of action are dismissed.

Done at Denver, Colorado, this 29th day of October, 1974.

BY THE COURT:

---

Richard P. Matsch, Judge  
United States District Court